

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 22 and 38 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 22-42 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

On page 2 of the Office Action, Claims 22-35 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,559,961 to Blonder (“Blonder”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent Claim 22 has been amended to recite in part:

displaying a selection code having a plurality of graphics including a plurality of decoy selection graphics;

displaying a response code having a plurality of graphics including a plurality of decoy response graphics and a matching response graphic, the matching response graphic having at least one property that, according to the stored user code, is associated with at least one property of at least one of the plurality of graphics from the selection code.

Support for this amendment may be found in at least Paragraphs [0046, 0047, 0052, and 0053] and FIGS. 1 and 2 of the Specification.

Blonder does not disclose displaying a selection code and displaying a response code. Blonder is directed to a “graphical password arrangement” and discloses “a user seeking access to a resource is presented with a predetermined image on a visual display and is required to point to (e.g. touch) one or more predetermined positions on the displayed image ... in a predetermined order.” Blonder, col. 1, ll. 50-54. Blonder does not disclose both “displaying a selection code having a plurality of graphics including a plurality of decoy selection graphics,” and “displaying a response code having a plurality of graphics including a plurality of decoy response graphics and a matching response graphic, the matching response graphic having at least one property that, according to the stored user code, is associated with at least one property of at least one of the plurality of graphics from the selection code,” as provided in Claim 22. Even if, *arguendo*, the predetermined image is a selection code, Blonder fails to disclose displaying a response code. Accordingly, Blonder fails to teach each and every element of Claim 22.

The Office Action asserts on page 3 that the password change function of Blonder (Blonder, col. 3, ll. 23-31; col. 3, l. 55 – col. 4, l. 25) displays a selection code and a response code. However, the password change function of Blonder does not disclose “logging on to the technical system upon checking that the selected graphic of the response code correlates with the stored user code,” as provided in Claim 22. Instead, Blonder discloses “PASSWD 16 marks the stored tap region sequence numbers and position coordinates in memory 12 as the new password, at step 332, enables the password function, at step 334, and then ends its execution, at step 336.” Blonder col. 4, ll. 21-25. Accordingly, Blonder’s password change function fails to teach each and every element of Claim 22.

Blonder further fails to disclose “receiving a selection of one of the plurality of graphics from the response code.” In contrast, the graphical password arrangement of Blonder “obtains and stores the coordinates of the selected location, at step 212. Hence, entry device 14 serves to identify, under the user’s control, the location selected by the user.” Blonder, col. 4, ll. 40-44. Blonder does not disclose “receiving a selection of one of the plurality of graphics from the

response code” as provided in Claim 22. Accordingly, Blonder fails to teach each and every element of Claim 22.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 22 is not anticipated by Blonder and is, therefore, patentable over Blonder. It is further submitted that Claims 23-35, which variously depend from Claim 22, are also patentable for at least the above reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claim 22 and corresponding dependent Claims 23-35 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

On page 5 of the Office Action, Claims 36-42 are rejected under USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blonder in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,209,104 to Jalili (“Jalili”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 36-37 depend from independent Claim 22, which is believed to be patentable over Blonder for at least the reasons argued above. Jalili fails to cure the deficiencies of Blonder with respect to independent Claim 22. For example, Claim 22, as amended, recites in part:

displaying a selection code having a plurality of graphics including a plurality of decoy selection graphics;

displaying a response code having a plurality of graphics including a plurality of decoy response graphics and a matching response graphic, the matching response graphic having at least one property that, according to the stored user code, is associated with at least one property of at least one of the plurality of graphics from the selection code.

Jalili is directed to “a secure data entry system” and discloses “the data elements that constitute the user’s predetermined password, known to the user, is retrieved and displayed on the user’s PC monitor in a display image.” Jalili, col. 3, ll. 3, 30-33. Jalili does not disclose “displaying a selection code having a plurality of graphics including a plurality of decoy selection graphics,” and “displaying a response code having a plurality of graphics including a plurality of

decoy response graphics and a matching response graphic, the matching response graphic having at least one property that, according to the stored user code, is associated with at least one property of at least one of the plurality of graphics from the selection code,” as provided in Claim 22. Accordingly, neither Blonder nor Jalili, in any permissible combination, disclose each and every element of independent Claim 22, from which Claims 36-37 depend.

Independent Claim 38 has been amended to recite in part

a display for displaying a selection code, the selection code including a plurality of graphics including a plurality of decoy graphics, the display further for displaying a response code, the response code including a plurality of graphics including a plurality of decoy response graphics and a matching response graphic, the matching response graphic having at least one property that, according to a stored user code, is associated with at least one property of at least one graphic of the selection code;

Support for this amendment may be found in at least Paragraphs [0046, 0047, 0052, and 0053] and FIGS. 1 and 2 of the Specification.

As discussed above with respect to independent Claim 22 and dependent Claims 36-37, Blonder discloses “a user seeking access to a resource is presented with a predetermined image on a visual display and is required to point to (e.g. touch) one or more predetermined positions on the displayed image ... in a predetermined order.” Blonder, col. 1, ll. 50-54. Jalili discloses “the data elements that constitute the user’s predetermined password, known to the user, is retrieved and displayed on the user’s PC monitor in a display image.” Jalili, col. 3, ll. 30-33. Both Blonder and Jalili fail to disclose displaying a selection code and displaying a response code as provided in Claim 38. As such, neither Blonder nor Jalili, in any proper combination, disclose each and every element of Claim 38.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 22 and 38 would not have been obvious in view of Blonder and/or Jalili. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 22 and 38 are patentable over Blonder in view of the Jalili. Claims 36-37 and 39-42,

which variously depend from Claims 22 and 38, are also patentable for at least the above reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claim 38 and dependent Claims 36-37 and 39-42 is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 16, 2011

By /John C. Geis/

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5788
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

John C. Geis
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 59,367